

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

---

*The Agitation of Thought is the Beginning of Truth.*

---

VOL. 9.

NEW-YORK, JUNE, 1854.

NO. 2.

---

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

---

## ADDRESS

*Delivered at the Eleventh Session of the American Institute of Homœopathia, held in Albany, June 7th, 1854.*

BY WILLIAM E. PAYNE, M.D.

GENTLEMEN OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF  
HOMŒOPATHIA:—

Art is the handmaid of science—it is science in act, or science in use. Art is the work, and a knowledge of the principles by which this work is performed, constitutes science. Science belongs exclusively to the world of mind—art to the world of matter. Science is an aggregate of principles—art is the result of the same principles brought down to the plane of every day life.

Technically and specifically, architecture is both a *science* and an *art*. The science of architecture is the aggregate of principles relating to proportions—the adaptation of parts for strength, etc. The art is the erection of an edifice according to the same principles. In the construction of a house, certain rules relating to length, width, height, and a certain finish, according to some determinate use, are studied. We obtain a knowledge of the required rules, and thus we are said to have a conception of the house—the house is mentally erected. A knowledge of all the rules necessary for the construction of an edifice that will subserve in the most perfect manner some determinate purpose, and most pleasing in its aspect, is what I understand in general, to be the science of architecture. Now, if we proceed on to erect the edifice according to these rules, we bring forth these rules, principles, or truths, and embody them on the plane of every day life—the construction of the edifice constitutes the art.

Medicine is both a *science* and an *art*. The *science* is an aggregate of principles, or rules, which point out to us the means of cure. The *art* is the preparation, and application of those means. The same is true of all other departments. This is what I understand to be the true relation of *art* and *science*.

If the idea is distinctly perceived and

acknowledged, it must be obvious that, as are the principles by which the work is performed, so must be the work performed by those principles. If the work is performed according to false conceptions, or according to an imperfect conception of principles, then the work must be necessarily imperfect, and fail in a greater or less degree of subserving the purpose intended. Then, as the *science* is, so must be the *art*, and conversely, as the *art* is, so must be the *science*. The tree is known by its fruit. This is precisely what we find in tracing the history of all the *arts* and *sciences*; and in *none* do we find these mutual characteristics more clearly demonstrated than in the history of the *art* and *science* of medicine.

Two methods have ever been pursued by mankind in the investigation of truth. One is called the *synthetic*, and the other the *analytic*. Synthesis begins its course of reasoning from assumed causes. Opinions, conjectures, hypotheses are formed. Then facts are sought in the field of experience for confirmation. If facts sometimes occur which do not exactly square with the hypothesis, they are made to bend, or are clothed with garments suited to the occasion. This had been the received method of investigating truth down to the time of Lord Bacon. But, I believe, in the whole history of scientific discoveries, not one of the physical sciences is known to have been discovered by this method.

*Analysis* is the inverse of *synthesis*. Analysis, which is also called induction, begins its course of reasoning from facts. By the skillful arrangement of a sufficient number of facts, their causes are seen. From facts, the progress is onward to principles—from effects to their causes. This has been a fruitful method of investigating truth. The *synthetic*, though equally barren of success in medicine, as in the investigation of other truths, yet it was pursued with uncommon persistence and ardor for two thousand years and upwards; and is still pursued, by what is termed the old school of medicine, with an ardor not much, if any, abated. Indeed, the whole pathway of medicine, presents one continued scene of wrecked theories and systems—theories

and systems which could not stand the test of experience.

In tracing the history of the world's progress in the *arts and sciences*, we find it marked by distinct epochs. Each department had its morning, its noon, and its night, and thence proceeded onward to a new day. It is quite certain, that some of the *arts and sciences* with the ancients, progressed to an altitude above the point at which they have arrived in modern times, and from thence descended in the lapse of ages, to a long, dark and cheerless night. In passing through these different periods, under the guidance of a Divine Providence, a preparation seems to have been made for an entrance upon a new and a higher state. Thus, in the long night which preceded the dawn of modern science, it were unjust to say that no good was accomplished. There were engaged in this great work, acute observers of facts—men self-sacrificing and unflinching in their endeavors after truth, and such men had laid aside a rich store of facts for future use. In the fullness of time, great men appeared upon the stage of human action, to arrange these facts—to generalize—to deduce therefrom general principles—to establish science. Such men were Euclid in mathematics, Archimedes in mechanics, Copernicus in astronomy, Newton in gravitation, and Hahnemann in medicine. Each of these great discoverers pursued the analytic, or inductive method of investigation. The whole history of medicine from Hippocrates to Hahnemann, a period of about two thousand five hundred years, presents but one series of changes. Except occasionally, a glimpse of the great law of cure. The history of medicine, is but the history of theories and revolutions. Every bold adventurer in the medical ranks, instead of interrogating nature, and learning her laws by a judicious experience, aspired to be the inventor of a theory, and the leader of a sect. Scarcely, however, had the new theory been given to the world, ere a powerful rival appeared with another theory, if not more plausible, destined alike with its predecessor to have its day, and like that, from the failure of its practical workings, to sink into an endless night.

The progress made in the healing art, and its estimate by some of the most illustrious members of the profession; men of genius, who devoted the labor of their lives to the practice of their art, and who attained to the highest honors which it was possible for the profession to bestow; we say, the true condition of medicine, may be seen in the voluntary confessions of such men as these.

Boerhaave, a distinguished professor at Leyden, and an illustrious physician, said: "If we compare the good which half a dozen true disciples of Esculapius have done since their art began, with the evil which

the immense number of doctors have inflicted upon mankind, we must be satisfied that it would have been infinitely better for mankind if medical men had never existed."

Van Helmont declared, that "medicine did not advance, but turned upon its axis."

Sir Gilbert Blane used the following remarkable language; and Dr. Pereira, the author of a voluminous work upon the Allopathic Materia Medica, and a violent opposer of Homœopathia, endorses the assertion: "In many cases," says Sir Gilbert, "patients get well in spite of the means employed; and sometimes when the physician fancies he has made a great cure, one may fairly assume the patient to have made a happy escape."

Sir William Knighton, who was physician to George the IV., says: "It is somewhat strange that, though in many arts and sciences, improvement has advanced in a step of regular progression from the first, in others it has kept no pace with time. Medicine seems to be one of those ill-fated arts, whose improvement bears no proportion to its antiquity."

Dr. Abercrombie says in his work on the Intellectual Powers, in relation to the action of medicines upon the body: "They are fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty."

Sir Astley Cooper says: "The science of medicine is founded on conjecture and improved by murder."

Dr. Gregory, author of a work on the Theory and Practice of Medicine, says: "Medical doctrines are little better than stark-staring absurdities."

Dr. Forbes, who stands at the head of the Allopathic school, and former editor of the British and Foreign Medical Review, after some critical reflections upon the imperfections of the Allopathic school, says: "As thus reflected in our critical mirror, the features of our ancient mother, (Allopathia) assuredly look somewhat unattractive. She seems neither happy nor prosperous; yea, she seems sick, very sick; her countenance is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought, from the strength of her inward throes. The genius and the mortal instruments are now in council, and her state, like to a little kingdom, is suffering the nature of an insurrection. And such, in truth, do we believe to be, literally, the condition of physic at this moment. Things have arrived at such a pitch that they cannot be worse. They must mend or end."

Those of us, gentlemen of the Institute, who have been practitioners in the Allopathic school know these to be truthful confessions.

If, then, such be the condition of the Allopathic art, after a period of two thousand years and upward, as represented by those of its adherents who were, and are capable of appreciating its claims, and who

would have pronounced its eulogy if they could, are we not justified in the inference that the principles by which they prescribed and still prescribe their remedies, are false?

Such, in brief, was the condition of the healing art, from its earliest history, down to the latter part of the last century.

In 1790, the dawn of a new day in the history and practice of medicine appeared. From the rich store of facts which had accumulated under the eagle eye of experience, through this long period of contending theories, the genius of Hahnemann educated a universal law of cure.

One would suppose, in the death of successful issues in the old practice of medicine, that the announcement of the discovery of such a law, would have been received by the profession with thankfulness, and hailed with gladness. But this was not the case. True to that spirit of intolerance—that spirit of bigotry and persecution which compelled Galileo to abjure in the most solemn manner upon his knees, his discovery of the great fact that the earth rotates, committed him to prison, and his books to the flames; that spirit of bigotry and persecution, which was let loose upon Harvey and Jenner, denouncing them as quacks, and denying them all professional intercourse; that spirit which gave to the discoverer of America, manacled limbs and a dungeon; we say, true to this, and the spirit of self-aggrandizement, the medical profession met Hahnemann's discovery with virulent opposition—maligning his motives, and pursued him with the most heartless rancor to the very end of his life. Would that we could say at the grave of Hahnemann, the shafts of envy and malice, fell from the grasp of his relentless pursuers. But this was not so. Hahnemann's death revealed to his persecutors the fact that he was the mistaken object of their pursuit. Hahnemann died, but the truth—the great law of cure—the enemy of theories, hypotheses and human inventions, of which he was the medium, did not die with him. As an example of the opposition to Hahnemann, we copy a notice of his death, *verbatim et literatim*, from the "Dublin Medical Press," a journal of some note in the Allopathic school. "It appears," says that Journal, "that old Hahnemann, the inventor of the Homœopathy humbug is dead, having protracted his existence by infinitesimal doses of nothing, to eighty-eight years, greatly to the consolation and edification of the patrons and patronesses of quacks and quackery." We might fill sheets with extracts such as this, but will not allow ourselves to dwell upon such heart-sickening exhibitions of degraded human nature; but will proceed onward to the contemplation of a theme more worthy the consideration of an intelligent community.

If we were yet without experimental evidence of the existence of a universal law

of cure, analogy, alone, would inevitably lead to the conclusion that such a law does exist—that such a law would be but the compliment of the great system of laws by which all operations in the physical world are carried on, and to which all observable phenomena are referable. Does the movement of a body on one occasion require the operation of a certain law, and at another time, and on another occasion, require the aid of another and very different law? The law of gravitation was not supposed by its discoverer to extend its influence beyond the immediate vicinity of the earth's surface; but the more speculative genius of Kepler led him further on in the investigation, till he arrived at the conclusion that gravitation was a force acting mutually from planet to planet; but more particularly from the earth to the moon. The limit of his research, however, did not bound the extent of the law. The more comprehensive genius of Newton demonstrated it to be a universal law, regulating not only the motions of all bodies upon and near the earth's surface, but also the motions of all celestial bodies—planets, satellites, and suns. Thus, the law that operates in forming the rain-drop, and bringing it down to the earth's surface is not only the same law that makes our earth a solid globe, keeps it in its orbit, and us, during our probation, denizens of its surface; but also binds into one common brotherhood, the countless orbs that roll on in interminable space. If, then, all hitherto observable phenomena in the motion of bodies, are referable to the known law of gravity, we certainly are justified in the conclusion that no other law of gravity exists.

All phenomena connected with the imponderable agents,—light, heat, electricity, etc., are referable to certain established laws.

In chemistry we have the same, and unvarying operation of known laws in all the observable phenomena connected therewith. All bodies aggregate under the influence of a certain law called *attraction of cohesion*. Mathematical proportions are observed in all such combinations with as much strictness as if the law possessed the faculty of rationality; and no departure from this, under the influence of the law, unmolested, ever happens.

In physiology, does not the blood, in obedience to an established law, always observe the same and undeviating course?—Does the blood to-day, in its perpetual round, flow out from the heart into the arteries, to every part of the body, to animate and nourish it, and return to that great central organ, purified in its return course by that living depurator—the lungs; and to-morrow take another, and entirely different course in obedience to another, and entirely different law? From infancy to vigorous manhood, from manhood to de-



crepit age, in both male and female, in sleeping or waking, in lying or standing, in health or in sickness, it flows on in the performance of its established use, in obedience to the same unvarying law.

Planets revolve, and are kept in their orbits, trees grow, and men and animals live, but each according to their own respective laws. If we admit these laws to be constant and perpetual, (and this must be admitted, unless shown to the contrary by actual experience,) then the same principle must be conceded in reference to the law of cure, unless actual experience otherwise demonstrates it.

But reason as we will—however acutely, however convincing to the understanding—the test is in experience. Experience here, as in every thing else, is the touchstone of truth.

Independent, then, of analogies, you, gentlemen of the Institute, have positive evidence of the existence of a universal law of cure in actual experience.

In what disease, or in what class of diseases, has not the homœopathic law, in competent hands, proved itself effective? Can you point to a single form of disease, in that long catalogue of chronic maladies, in which Homœopathia has failed of accomplishing her end? Consumption of the lungs—cancerous affections—dropsy, not only general, but local, of the brain, chest, abdomen, etc.—dyspepsias—neuralgias—convulsions—St. Vitus' dance—lockjaw—hydrophobia—spinal and hip diseases—diseases of the heart—paralysis—rheumatism—rickets—scrofulous affections, and the multiplied varieties of skin disease—all have yielded to the power of remedies applied according to the great homœopathic law of cure.

In acute maladies its effect is no less certain, but more striking from the promptness of the action. Who that has been under the care of a competent homœopathic physician, during repeated attacks of painful and acute affections, has not felt the silent, but mighty power of a remedy applied according to this law? *Inflammation of the brain, the spinal marrow, the eye, the ear, the tongue, the throat, the lungs, the heart, the stomach, the liver, the spleen, the kidneys, the intestines, etc.*; together with *general fevers, inflammatory, intermittent, typhus, ship and yellow fevers, small pox, scarlatina and measles, influenza and hooping cough, dysentery and diarrheas*, have yielded, as if by magic, to remedies applied according to the homœopathic law. And last, though by no means least, in Asiatic cholera—that scourge of the human race—what was the effect? When allopathia had exhausted the whole catalogue of her impotent means to stay its desolating march, as a kind of forlorn hope—as a last resort, homœopathia was permitted to enter the field. Con-

fident in her own inherent strength, she marched up to the contest with a firm and unfaltering tread, and that mysterious disease, which had hitherto defied the combined effects of allopathic skill, yielded an easy captive to its mighty power.

You all know very well, gentlemen of the Institute, the comparative results of both methods of treatment. While the average mortality under allopathic practice, run along the scale to 75 per cent., that under the homœopathic stopped at 13 in the one hundred. Here, then, was a long stretch between the two points of mortality; and in that disease, too, where all acknowledge that the most powerful remedies must be used, and that quickly, or the patient dies. This was a mighty triumph for poor, despised homœopathia; and an epoch in her history that will be long remembered with gratitude by her friends, and with mortification by her foes.

But no more marked are the comparative results between the homœopathic and allopathic treatment of cholera, than in the treatment of that terrible scourge of the tropical regions—yellow fever. That appalling epidemic, which last year swept along the valley of the Mississippi—extending its devastating course over the whole south-west, almost depopulating some of the busiest and fairest cities of that region of our country, encountered no check from medical treatment, until, as in cholera, as a last resort, the aid of a few pioneers in the work of medical reform, in that region of country, was implored. Having a universal and unerring law of cure to guide them in the choice of remedies, they had no need to watch the course of the epidemic, to experiment with this drug and that, to first see thousands hurried to that bourne from whence no traveller returns, before they could hope to meet this, hitherto untried disease, with success. As Hahnemann, merely from a description of the symptoms of cholera, without ever having seen a case, was enabled to point out, by the aid of the law of cure, which he had discovered, the remedies that have, ever since, proved so successful in the treatment of that disease; so the homœopathic physicians of the South, by the aid of the same principles, were enabled to meet yellow fever, at the very outset, in the most prompt and efficient manner. So much superior did the homœopathic prove, over the allopathic, in that frightful pestilence—such an impression did this fact make upon the public mind, that the Trustees of the Mississippi State Hospital, located at Natchez, appointed Homœopaths as physicians and surgeons to that Institution, to take the places of the most distinguished allopathic physicians, which they, hitherto had been able to find. The trustees, themselves, declare that they were actuated, in this course, by the superior success of the homœopath-

ic treatment of yellow fever. This has been a long established, and well endowed Hospital, under the exclusive control of the allopathic school, ever since its foundation; and this signal triumph of homœopathy, in the year 1843, both over disease and popular prejudice, engendered by the machinations of a designing enemy, is but another epoch in the history of the new school.

With these results before us, gentlemen of the Institute—results, the truth of which do not rest upon the unsupported testimony of interested witnesses of the medical profession, but upon the testimony of thousands who have suffered from disease, and could find no help but in homœopathia—with these facts before us, are we not justified in believing the homœopathic law to be a universal law of cure?

If, then, every form of disease has been successfully treated by the homœopathic law, the question arises, why may not every case of disease be cured by the operation of the same law? We answer, every disease may; that is, every disease that has not passed beyond a certain point; for there is a point in the progress of disease, beyond which, restoration is not possible. The reason why all curable cases that come under the care of homœopathic physicians, are not cured, I shall endeavor to point out.

The principal causes of failure may be embraced under three heads. They relate, first, to the *materia medica*; second, to the *physician*; and third, to the *patient*.

The law of cure, discovered by Hahnemann, is expressed by the Latin formula, *similia similibus curantur*, which simply means, that a drug which has the power of producing, in the healthy body, a certain abnormal or diseased condition, will cure a similar abnormal or diseased condition, which has arisen in the system from any other cause. Thus, *Rhubarb* has the power of producing in the healthy body, diarrhœa, with the following symptoms: *Flatulent distension of the abdomen. Cutting and pinching colic pains. Sour smelling, or sometimes fetid, and pappy evacuations, accompanied with shuddering, and violent urging, increased by motion. Sour, flat, slimy, and sometimes bitter taste in the mouth.* We often meet with cases of diarrhœa, especially with children, exhibiting the above symptoms. Whenever we meet such a case, we know *Rhubarb* is the remedy, for we see an exact correspondence between the symptoms of *Rhubarb*, as recorded in our *Materia Medica*, and the symptoms of the disease. This exact similarity between the *Rhubarb* symptoms, and the symptoms of the disease, makes the *Rhubarb* homœopathic to the disease. This principle of choosing and applying the remedy, must be followed in all cases, or the

cure fails. It will be seen, then, in order to make the homœopathic principle of choosing remedies, universally available, in the treatment of diseases, we must first obtain a knowledge of the symptoms or diseases which drugs will produce upon the body in a state of health. This knowledge we have already obtained, respecting many remedies, through the indefatigable zeal of Hahnemann and his co-laborers. There were found in the medical ranks, self-sacrificing members, who were willing to undertake, in connection with Hahnemann, the proving of drugs upon themselves, for the sake of obtaining knowledge of the means to make the sick well. The drugs thus proved, and their symptoms recorded, constitute the homœopathic *Materia Medica*. This proving of drugs on the healthy body, is still pursued by homœopathic physicians, with a zeal by no means abated.—There is, at this time, a regularly organized society in this country, called the American Provers' Union, organized by the indefatigable zeal of Dr. Hering of Philadelphia, and now in successful operation, every member of which is bound by the most sacred obligations to prove upon himself, and those of his friends who may be induced to undertake it, at least one drug every year. Similar societies are in successful operation in Europe. Thus we have added to our *Materia Medica*, one or more thoroughly proved drug every year.

Homœopathia as an art, rests upon the great truth, that every disease has its specific—every poison its antidote. This great fact in nature, is so constantly demonstrated to us, by the experience of every-day life, so consonant with our rational conceptions of the goodness and parental care of an All Wise Providence, it is difficult to conceive that a system of medicine, which had not this as its basis, could have held sway so long, as has the old system of medical practice, in the minds of rational men. This claim of homœopathy, first led me, as it doubtless has many others, to investigate its pretensions.

Homœopathia, then, we say, is essentially the science of specifics. A disease that Sulphur will not cure, cannot be cured (in the proper acceptation of the word cure,) by any other drug. It is not meant by this, that a disease for which *Sulphur* is the specific, can never get well unless *Sulphur* is used. In acute diseases, a recovery is often the result of the reactive powers of the system. This reaction may be induced by some violent impression made upon the system from without, of which hydropathic treatment furnishes the best example in point, or, it may follow the unaided reactive powers of life, as we witness, sometimes, in the accession, course and termination in health, of acute maladies, without the employment of any means. But in chronic diseases, as we shall have

occasion to show, a cure never can be effected except by the use of the specific medicine. All cures which result from any other mode of procedure, are only apparent cures—mere palliations, which last only for a definite period.

The objects of the surrounding world admit of a two-fold division, and bears a two-fold relation to man. One is for the formation and sustentation of his body when in a state of health, and the other for his restoration when he becomes diseased. The one we call *nutrients*, and the other *poisons*. They are both exclusively for his use, either directly or indirectly; and he is intimately and directly connected with the one, and at the same time, remotely, with the other. We call *nutrients* supporters, and *poisons* destroyers of life; but they are only relatively so. Thus, that which imparts nutriment and support to the body in a state of health, becomes the aggravator and perpetuator of disease, and the ally of death, when the body is sick. Nature indicates man's true and present relation with these forms, in the most positive manner. Thus we have evidence that the body changes its relation to nutrient forms, on the accession of disease, in the loss of appetite, which often increases to an utter disgust; and in the aggravation and untoward symptoms which result, when food is forced upon an unwilling stomach. Another important truth is the entire suspension of the assimilative and eliminating processes, as indicated in the fact that the body seldom or never emaciates, even under the influence of acute diseases, as long as there is an entire disgust of food, but when the appetite returns, emaciation goes on for a time very rapidly, for the reason that the body, as it were, preys upon itself. The wants created by the renewed eliminating and assimilative processes, cannot be supplied at once by the enfeebled digestive organs. Who ever heard of death resulting from the non-reception of food when there was an utter loathing?

On the other hand, those substances which operate as poisons upon the body, in a state of health—which the body rejects in the most positive manner, as foreign to its wants, become supporters of life, when the body is diseased. From this class we obtain all the medicines that compose the homœopathic *Materia Medica* and from which we select our remedies in treatment of disease. Now, as in accordance with the homœopathic law, every disease has its specific, and every product comprising the class of our second division, is specific or homœopathic to some form of disease, and farther, but a limited number of these substances have, as yet, been proved upon the healthy body, an indispensably requisite to their use—it follows that a disease may arise, for which no homœopathic or specific remedy is yet

known. If called upon to treat such a case, it is perfectly evident that we must fail of success. Thus, *Glonoine* is a remedy but recently introduced into the homœopathic *Materia Medica*. The proving of this drug is yet limited; but sufficiently extended to show it to be specific or homœopathic to a peculiar form of headache.—This drug will produce in the healthy subject a violent throbbing pain in the temples and cerebral portions of the head, much aggravated by motion; a constricted feeling about the throat, as if bound by a ligature, producing a full feeling in the head, as if about to burst. At the same time there is rapidity of the circulation, with more or less violent action of the heart. *Glonoine*, which has the power of producing such a combination of symptoms, will cure a similar combination by virtue of the homœopathic law, arising from any other cause. Many such headaches have been cured by *Glonoine*. But previous to the proving of this drug, such a headache could not be cured. This kind of headache was subject, alone, to the unaided efforts of nature; or, at best, but slight palliation was the result of medical treatment. There are many drugs of vast importance, which have not been proved, and therefore, the diseases to which they are homœopathic, must remain subject to palliation alone, until the power of these drugs is ascertained by experiment upon the healthy subject.

In this incompleteness, then, of our *Materia Medica*, and not in the homœopathic law, may lie the causes of occasional failures in the treatment of disease by homœopathic physicians. But this source of failure is comparatively unimportant, as the homœopathic *Materia Medica* already embraces between three and four hundred remedies, many of which are pretty thoroughly proved; and the addition of new remedies is being made every year; so we may confidently hope that this source of failure will be, before long, among the things that were.

But a more fruitful source of failure, perhaps, is a lack of understanding on the part of the physician, of the true characteristics of those remedies already proved. Here, you are aware, gentlemen of the Institute, is a difficulty which time, and the united labor of minds which can justly rank with the great discoverers of the world, only can overcome. This difficulty may be acknowledged without disparaging the capacity of any. All cannot be discoverers of great truths; and all cannot equally well apply principles in the cultivation of the arts. We work according to the measure of our capacities.

The homœopathic *Materia Medica* is yet, as is well known, and as might be supposed, not only in a limited, but also in an imperfect state. We need another Hahné



mann, in point of industry, indomitable perseverance and intellectual capacity, to generalize—to arrange particulars under general heads—to dispose the crude materials, of which we have an abundance, into scientific order; in other words, to complete the work which he so auspiciously begun. Many champions have already entered the arena, and are manfully wrestling with the difficulties which now lie in our way; and we may confidently hope that some one of these earnest seekers after truth, will ere long secure the prize. When this is accomplished, all will be able to select the remedy with comparative ease; and thus *this* source of failure will sink into insignificance.

I cannot, perhaps, do better than take as an example a case which occurred in the earlier part of my own practice, to illustrate this point of my subject. The same case was related on another occasion to the Institute; but it so clearly illustrates the point under consideration, I doubt not the repetition will be excused.

The patient had been an asthmatic for twenty years. He had exhausted the skill of Alloëopathia, without perceptible results; but in making the tour of quackdom, chanced upon a nostrum that suppressed his asthma, but gave in return, what was called cramp of the stomach. These attacks, which were of frequent recurrence, were more alarming, and far more painful, than his worst paroxysms of asthma; and moreover resisted, with equal pertinacity, all attempts on the part of Alloëopathia to subdue them. *Morphia*, followed by cathartics, however, usually brought a temporary suspension of suffering; but every subsequent attack proved more unyielding, until the patient gave up all hope of cure from this quarter. At this stage of the case, at the earnest solicitation of his friends, he determined to try Homœopathia. I was called. The following were the more prominent symptoms of the case: cramp-like pains in the right side of the chest, extending forwards and downwards to the epigastrium, and through to the back. No soreness on pressure, nor did the pain seem influenced by respiration or motion of the body. Extremities cold, and the whole body at times bathed in a cold, clammy perspiration. Pulse full, slow, and oppressed. During the paroxysms, he exhibited an inconceivable degree of physical strength, clenching objects with an iron grasp; and assumed almost every position in which the body could be placed. An almost insupportable sinking at the epigastrium succeeded these exacerbations. The paroxysms were remittent, but never intermittent. Hitherto an attack had never subsided without the employment of powerful opiates. This, in general, was the condition of the patient when he had been under my charge for about ten hours. I

had used every medicine which seemed to bear any relation to his disease, but all without the least perceptible effect. This was the first trial of Homœopathia. Relief had always been more prompt under the old treatment. The patient was failing. Friends were anxious. Confidence with its friends even, in this case, was shaken. They judged the efficacy of the principle by my failure to make it available. What is to be done? was the question constantly recurring to my mind. Shall I abandon the patient to Alloëopathia, from which I am sure he will gain nothing but palliation; or shall I palliate myself, and during the interval of relief, institute one more search for a remedy? I determined to pursue the latter course; for, if I did not succeed, the patient would be no worse off than if now turned over to the old practice. I could then surrender him, for I had long before determined never to attempt a cure by alloëopathic means. I accordingly gave an anodyne. The expected relief followed, which was perfectly satisfactory to the patient and friends—but far otherwise with me. Through the night he was free from pain, but did not sleep. I gave nothing on the following day, though the pain gradually but slowly increased, as the effects of the anodyne passed off. In the meantime, I employed all leisure moments in searching for a remedy to meet the case. The succeeding night was one of suffering; and I was again called at early dawn to renew my hitherto impotent efforts to quell the disease. The pain had already increased to an alarming extent. I had chosen the only remedy which I proposed trying, upon the failure of which I determined to abandon all further attempts to meet the case—not from the conclusion that the homœopathic law was insufficient, but that the *art* was not sufficiently developed, or that my knowledge of remedies was too limited to enable me to adapt one to the case in hand. I had no questions to ask respecting the development of new symptoms. I had pre-determined, and it only remained to carry my determination into act. I therefore ordered water, into half a tumbler of which I dropped three drops of *Colchicum Autumnale* of the third attenuation, and gave a single teaspoonful of the mixture. Immediate relief followed, and when I took my leave, perhaps ten minutes from the time of entering his apartment, he was almost wholly relieved. Several years have elapsed, but the pain has never returned.

Had I abandoned this case, as I was often on the point of doing, I might have decided that either the homœopathic law was at fault, or our list of proved remedies did not contain one homœopathic to the disease; when, in fact, neither was the case, as the result proved.

This case illustrates what I mean when

saying, failures of cure sometimes result from a want of knowledge on the part of the physician, of those remedies already proved, and embraced in our *Materia Medica*.

But a far more frequent cause of failure than either of the above mentioned, lies with the patient. To be successful, a correct knowledge of all the symptoms must be first obtained. Symptoms constitute the out-spoken, the audible language of disease. They indicate the true character of disease more surely than words, and acts indicate the true character of the mind; for words and acts may be hypocritical, but symptoms never. All we can ever know of disease is what we learn by this language of nature.

In every case of disease there are two classes of symptoms. One is called *subjective* and the other *objective*. Subjective symptoms are those which depend for their analysis and true representation, upon certain faculties of the patient; such as *perception, comparison, and description*. In this class of symptoms, pain is perhaps the most prominent. Now, this system often proves a fallacious guide to the physician, for the simple reason that he does not often get a true idea of its character from the patient. If the patient has the faculty of perceiving, mentally, the difference in the character of pain, he is often deficient of the faculty of comparison and description. He cannot tell you whether the pain is *cutting, shooting, tearing, drawing, pressing, gnawing, or burning*. Hence the physician's knowledge, without some more reliable information, must be, necessarily, inferential. This will not answer the accurate demands of Homœopathia. The symptoms of the disease must correspond in every particular with the symptoms of the drug, or success will not follow. The inability of the patient to describe his symptoms, accounts for a large proportion of the failures which occur in Homœopathic practice. The sick must learn to analyze their sensations and communicate them accurately to the physician, before this source of failure will cease.

But there is another class of symptoms which will never deceive us—they always speak facts. Upon these symptoms the physician should always place his greatest reliance. They are called *objective*, because they are the special objects of the senses—such as sight, hearing, touch, etc. They are independent of the control of the patient. The physician does not depend for his knowledge of them, upon the patient's just appreciation of sensations.—The appearance of the skin—eruptions etc., motions of the heart, the general aspect of the countenance, the physical signs of respiration, and the excretions of the body, are embraced in this class of symptoms.—Upon these symptoms, in the treatment of

infants, we have to rely almost wholly; and the truthfulness of these signs, in my judgment, accounts for our superior success in the treatment of this class of patients.

But a still greater obstacle to a successful issue in the homœopathic treatment of diseases, lies in this:—the patient is in haste to recover. Immediate effects from the remedy must be seen—a cure must be performed right off, or the patient is not satisfied to continue the treatment. This you know, gentlemen, is impossible. The very nature of chronic maladies precludes the possibility.

*Chronic and acute maladies* differ widely from each other in their character and course. Their relation is comparatively like temptations, in the moral world, to the hereditary depravity of mankind. The one comes from without, and the other is inherent in the constitution. As in temptations, there is a constant endeavor to excite into activity the hereditary evils of our nature, so in acute maladies there is a constant effort to rouse into activity the dormant hereditary tendency to disease. We might extend this parallelism, but time will not permit. Therefore, with these hints we leave it for the consideration of those who are curious enough to pursue the investigation. While acute diseases arise from impression made from without, such as telluric influences, sudden atmospheric changes, over and improper eating, and are generally under the control of the recuperative powers of the system, chronic diseases are inherent in the constitution; they lie at the very foundation of the physical organism,—the constitution is defective in its incipient formation. Acute diseases are the result of a violation of the physical laws of life, and are never transmitted to the offspring; but chronic diseases are the result of a violation of the moral laws of life. They are acquired little by little, and are transmitted with as much certainty to the offspring, as are mental peculiarities. This inheritance, in various ways, acquires additional importance and power, in passing down through the multiplied generations of ages, until whole families are swept off by it. This we see manifested more especially in diseases of the lungs. The cure consists in a change to a greater or less degree of the physiological action of the whole organism, by specific remedies. This change can be effected only by a long course of homœopathic treatment.

This is the form of disease, gentlemen of the Institute, which we are often called upon to cure, in a week—a month, or at furthest, in a few months; and by those, too, who have exhausted the whole resources of the allopathic art, and thus made the disease worse by complicating it with the diseased action of drugs. If we are wise



enough not to commit ourselves to such a promise, but frankly state the fact that it will require one, three, five, or more years to perform the cure, our honest and truthful declaration is often construed into an implied acknowledgment that our art is unavailing. But it is better, far better, gentlemen, to protect the honor of Homœopathia, by refusing to take charge of such cases, until the patient promises entire submission, either from an intelligent understanding of the transcendent powers of Homœopathia; or from a conviction that all other means are unavailing.

When mankind trust less to the blind teachings of theorists and system-makers, and more to their own personal investigation of truth, by rational induction,—when all make it a point to study the laws of life and health, and to better understand diseases and their cure, as matters pertaining to their own personal welfare; then, by the aid afforded him by the patient, the office of the physician will be less arduous,—his prescriptions more sure in their aim, and, of course, more unavailing in their consequences.

Thus, gentlemen, we have endeavored to show, first, both by analogy and experience, that there is a universal law of cure, and that this law is the homœopathic.—Next, we have attempted to point out the true causes of failure, with homœopathic physicians, where a cure is not performed. We have seen that the cure sometimes fails, from the limited condition of the homœopathic *Materia Medica*; and sometimes from a want of knowledge, on the part of the physician, of the true character of those remedies already possessed. But a far more fruitful source of failure is shown to be, the unenlightened condition of the patient, and his haste to recover.

If these points have been made sufficiently clear, the work before us, gentlemen, is obvious. The homœopathic law we may set down as a fixed fact—yea, a universal law of cure—unchangeable and eternal, as is the Author of all truth. To search the archives of nature for the purpose of discovering a law to guide us in the choice of our remedies, we have no further need.—This object has been gained. Hahnemann had the mental organization equal to the work, and his endeavors, under the guidance of Divine Providence, were crowned with success. Our attention now is to be directed solely to extending and perfecting the means of making this law universally available in the treatment of disease. In furtherance of this object, we must continue the work of perfecting our *Materia Medica*. In the true self-sacrificing spirit of Hahnemann and his co-laborers in this great work, we must submit ourselves to the sickening influence of drugs; in the true self-sacrificing spirit of Christian philanthropy, we must immolate our love of

self upon the altar of human progress and human welfare. In other words, we must not only be *willing*, but we must actually become sick, that we may obtain a knowledge of the means to make the sick well.

This is not a work which is to subserve the necessities of a day—an age—or a generation, only; but it is a work which is to subserve the necessities of mankind in all coming time. When the allopathic *Materia Medica* shall be remembered and retained by the curious only as a memorial of the dark ages of medical science, the homœopathic will occupy an indispensable position, and one as positive and permanent in the wants of the race, as the simplest elementary rules of mathematical science.

A work of no less importance than the proving of drugs upon ourselves, is the arrangement of symptoms, thus obtained, into scientific order. Whoever shall do this, will take rank with the great discoverers of the world. Until this work is accomplished, let no member of the profession fail to give it his most earnest attention. We must not forget, that none but earnest and sincere seekers are permitted to enter the temple of truth. And no one should think himself beneath the possibility of becoming the medium of a truth of such magnitude—the instrument of a beneficence so immense to the race. Earnestness of purpose will accomplish much; and in the present struggle going on between the new and the old school of medicine—between truth and falsity, he who has not this energy of purpose to sustain him in the contest, had better not engage.

It is perhaps unnecessary to urge the importance of employing every opportunity to enlighten the public mind upon these three great points, viz.: the true nature of disease—the universal law of cure, and the necessary means to make that law universally applicable in the treatment of the sick. However well the physician may act his part, however perfect may become the homœopathic *Materia Medica*, both in extent and arrangement; and however proficient the physician may become in its use, without the co-operation of the patient—unless he is able to give an intelligible idea of his own symptoms, and knows enough of the true nature of disease to give each remedy its proper time to work, failures must of necessity follow.

Just in the degree that these three things are accomplished, viz.: the extension of the homœopathic *Materia Medica* to its utmost limits—its scientific arrangement—and the enlightenment of the public mind upon the whole science and art of medicine, in the same degree will the difficulties in the way of a successful issue in the treatment of disease disappear.

With this broad field of usefulness before us—with consequences so momentous to the well-being of man, who of us, gentle-

men, that has the love of human welfare glowing in our bosoms, will not enter heart and hand into this great work? A rich harvest, yet, lies before us, ready for the sickle—waving an invitation to the reapers; and he must gather instead of heedlessly trampling under foot, who would merit, and receive the closing commendation of the great master, "well done, thou good and faithful servant."

What nobler object than this can animate us,—can enlist the faculties with which the Creator has endowed us? The comfort—the progress—the welfare of the human race is the end, and an approving conscience the reward.

#### HAHNEMANN'S PSORIC PATHOLOGY.

FROM Professor Henderson's able reply to Dr. Simpson, who wrote against Homœopathy: whose work has been greatly applauded by the allopathic press of this country, we extract the following on the *psoric* doctrine; which will shed light in some dark places; and shows how limited is the knowledge of some of our allopathic brethren of the doctrines of their own school:

"In 1828, one of his most celebrated works, *Chronic Diseases, their peculiar Nature and Homœopathic Treatment*, made its appearance. In this publication, he gave forth his opinions on the ancient doctrine of *psora*, as a constitutional taint to which a vast variety of the most important, chiefly chronic, diseases owed their existence. So far was he from claiming the credit of being the originator of this pathological doctrine, that he adduces, in support of his own decision in its favor, nearly a hundred allopathic authorities, his predecessors, as having more or less explicitly declared their conviction of its truth, or given examples in illustration of it. It is ignorantly sneered at by Dr. Simpson, and the many who take up the cuckoo-cry of derision against every thing that Hahnemann taught, as the *itch-doctrine* of the Homœopaths, whereas, it is neither an itch-doctrine in a candid and intelligent sense, nor is it a peculiarly homœopathic doctrine. "I call it *psora*," says Hahnemann, "with a view of giving it a general designation;" and that he did not regard it as *synonymous* with, or limited in its meaning to, the *itch*, every one knows who has perused his treatise on the subject. One sentence of his is sufficient of itself to settle this point, and to leave those who have so industriously misrepresented his opinions utterly without excuse. "I am persuaded that not only are the majority of the innumerable skin diseases which have been described and distinguished by Wil-

lan, but also almost all the pseudo-organizations, etc., etc., with few exceptions, merely the products of the multiform *psora*."

Like Milton invoking Urania, Hahnemann might say, in reference to the *psoric* hypothesis: "The meaning, not the name, I call;" and the meaning he plainly and expressly announced was this, that the majority of chronic diseases that appear as palsies, asthmas, dyspepsias, consumptions, headaches, epilepsies, vertigoes, etc., etc., are due to a morbid matter (or miasm, as he termed it) existing in the body: the same as that which, when it comes to the skin, produces the almost numberless varieties of eruptions known as scaly diseases, leprosy, milk-crusts, scald-heads, ring-worms, itch, pustules, and the like. *Psora* was an ancient term used almost indiscriminately for every diversity of chronic, and almost every kind of acute cutaneous disease; and no term appeared more convenient as a "general designation" for the radical malady of which all these local diseases, both internal and external, were occasional expressions or developments, than that which already, for ages, had associated with it the idea of constitutional taint (*dyscrasia*), that might show itself in operation on the surface, or indicate its activity within by the throes of some hidden organ. Dr. Simpson is heartily welcome to rescue his *protégé*, the *itch-insect*, from the society of so many fulsome maladies, since he has taken a fancy to that comely production; and, when he does, the *psoric* hypothesis of chronic diseases will remain *substantially one of the most incontrovertible doctrines even in modern pathology*. This is not the occasion—any reasonable space will not admit of it—on which to discuss this doctrine completely and satisfactorily; but I throw down the gauntlet before the Professor of Midwifery, and challenge him to argue the point, were it only for the honor of his sect, if he believes them to be committed to the rejection of the *psoric* hypothesis. But they are not committed to any thing of the kind. The *psoric* hypothesis, *essentially as held by Hahnemann*, was held by his allopathic predecessors; is held by his allopathic successors, and *among them only, as an itch-doctrine*; and *must* be held in some degree by every medical man of common sense and common information.

It was held by his allopathic predecessors: take an example from a work that was published before Hahnemann was born, by Frederick Hoffmann, who laid "the basis of the pathology at present taught in the schools of medicine." After adverting to the occurrence of pains in the joints on the cessation of ulcers in the legs, he adds: "We have known, likewise, atrocious pains of the joints suddenly removed on the occurrence of *psora* or *itch* (*psora vel scabies*) having the character of white lepra. For,

whilst shifting of the morbid matter from internal to external parts is very beneficial ; on the contrary, what turns from the external to the internal parts is most pernicious." Having said, again, that "the true proximate, and immediate cause of these evils," which he describes as pustules, itch, papule, etc., "is nothing else, than an impure, viscid, and acrid serum," (Hahnemann never was so minute) which is proved to be virulent and violent "because almost all the most serious and deadly diseases, both chronic and acute, and these the most firmly rooted in the system of nervous parts, may be relieved, on the matter being expelled, according to the habit of body ; and on the contrary, the matter being repelled to the interior parts, the same diseases may be excited ;" he adds : "Experience itself teaches this truth : for innumerable observations of the most credible authors exist, which record that spasmodic asthma, inflammation of the joints, gout, and many other diseases, have been removed on the appearance of itch, (scabies,) and on the other hand, have arisen on the itch being suppressed." Among the many "other diseases" which Hoffmann ascribes to the itch ; throughout his *Opera Omnia*, are epilepsy, amaurosis, hematuria, consumption, rickets, whooping-cough, apoplexy, rheumatism. Though he often employs the term *scabies* (itch) in designating the disease, which was thus the frequent source of those serious maladies, he did not, any more than Hahnemann by the equivalent term *psora*, mean to specify a particular kind of skin disease, but one or other of the many eruptions to which the surface was liable. Thus, he speaks of a *psora* or *scabies* like white lepra (*Lepa alba*) ; so that in fact almost any chronic skin disease was *psora* or *scabies* with him, as with older writers in general. Let the above suffice as a specimen of Hahnemann's hundred allopathic authorities for the *psoric* hypothesis. I have given Hoffmann merely because I have his works at hand.

Next, the *psoric* doctrine is held by the allopathic successors of Hahnemann. Schönlein, the allopathic Professor of Pathology and Therapeutics in the University of Berlin, in a clinical lecture on a case of organic disease of the heart, with dropsy, delivered himself thus : "What is the cause of this affection ? On looking backwards, we find no other complaint than the itch. Latterly, the admission of consequences of the itch, that *old medical dogma*, is not only become dubious, but has been abandoned and turned into ridicule. Among the older physicians, we particularly notice Autenreith, who wrote a masterly treatise on this subject, so that it was remarkably impudent in Hahnemann to pretend that he was the first to point out the consequences of the itch. . . . I must con-

less that, according to my own observations, and those of many other physicians who deserve the fullest confidence, I have no doubt whatever about the existence of consequences of the itch." The work of Autenreith, to which reference is made in the preceding passage, as containing an anticipation of Hahnemann's doctrine regarding *psora*, has the following very explicit declaration on the subject, showing how completely the *psoric* hypothesis owes its parentage to Allopathy : "The most formidable, and, in our country, the most frequent source of the chronic diseases of the adult, are the itch eruptions, badly treated by sulphur ointment, or by other active greasy applications. I have so often seen the misery which the itch occasions to the lowest classes, and to those who follow sedentary occupations ; and I see it daily in such a manifold and melancholy aspect, that I do not hesitate a moment to declare it loudly as a subject worthy of the observation of every physician, and even of every magistrate, who lays to heart the health of those committed to his care." This is sufficiently decisive, and curious too, considering the recent attempts to palm the *itch*-doctrine on Hahnemann. Schönlein claims it for Allopathy, and, with the ignorance which is universal among allopathic writers, who would depreciate Hahnemann, accuses the discoverer of Homœopathy with arrogating to himself the discovery, also, of the *itch*-doctrine, though he expressly refers to nearly a hundred preceding authors, in confirmation of his own views regarding it. Schönlein's lecture is curious in another respect. The discrimination of a particular disease, which should be distinguished as *itch* from all other skin diseases, by its insect, (or rather arachnoid,) more especially, is entirely a modern accomplishment ; indeed, as a general attainment, it is but a very few years old, and was not recognized at all by Hahnemann ; perhaps it was even unknown to him that the itch could ever be so distinguished, notwithstanding that the insect had long been ascertained to occur, in connection with an eruption on the skin. By the term *psora*, Hahnemann did not mean the special disease which Schönlein and his contemporaries discriminate as the *itch*, but without distinctive scaly, papular, and tettery eruptions of all kinds. It is plain, therefore, that the *itch*-doctrine is a modern allopathic one, and by no means the doctrine of Hahnemann, which is, on the contrary, the *psoric*-doctrine. Dr. Simpson must, therefore, keep his itch to himself ; we have nothing to do with it, and never had, in the same sense as modern Allopathy has a right to it. Hahnemann, indeed, in treating of the primary form of *psora*, which he regarded as contagious, probably to account for its extensive prevalence, adverts to an eruption of vesicles



or pustules, distinguished by *itching*, (when there is an eruption at the outset, which, however, he holds not to be always the case,) but as that is a symptom common to the *itch*, and to many pustular eruptions, as well as in a very excessive degree to the vesicular *eczema*, it affords no evidence whatever, that the skin disease he speaks of, as the primary form of cutaneous psora, was the same as that which we now distinguish as the *itch*. The presence of the *Acarus*, or *Sarcoptes scabiei*, termed the *itch insect*, is now generally held to be the distinctive characteristic of the *itch*; and Hahnemann, knowing nothing of the essential part it plays in that disease, cannot be regarded as having necessarily referred to what is now called *itch*, especially when we remember how closely *eczema* often resembles *itch*—the insect being put out of view. What makes this remark entitled to more weight, is the fact, that *eczema* may be contagious, as well as the scabies or *itch* which it so closely resembles. Mr. Erasmus Wilson, in his work on Skin Diseases, admits this fact, although he limits the action of the eczematous matter which excites the disease in another to mere non-specific irritation. And still further to show that Hahnemann's observations did not refer specially to the *itch*, as distinguished from itching vesicular and pustular diseases in general, it is worthy of being noticed, that the minute doses of *Sulphur* he recommends as having been successful in the cure of the primary eruption, are incapable of curing *itch* with its insect, though they do cure *eczema*.

One important point in which Hahnemann's views of psora differed from those of his predecessors was this, that while they regarded internal diseases as producible only when the psoric matter was *driven in* from the surface of the body, he thought that the constitution might be elsewhere seriously disordered by the "miasm," while the skin was also affected, and that it was not necessary that the skin should ever be affected, though it generally or often was. The "miasm," once ensconced in the body, might, in his opinion, act any where according to circumstances, internally or externally; though of course, when its principal operations were conducted on the surface, the more deeply seated parts enjoyed comparative repose. His psoric doctrine, therefore, was almost identical in its principles, with the modern *dyscrasic* pathology, which recognizes a *morbific admixture*, taint, or poison of some kind, as the cause of a great many chronic diseases. Indeed, there is at present, a *mania* among physicians on this subject. Almost every disease is now being traced to morbid matters and animal poisons in the blood. The *solids* of the body are, in the estimation of some pathologists—and these of no mean note—the mere creatures and appendages

of the fluids, and are all but utterly deprived of any other standing in health or disease, than as the field on which the fluids execute their *dévoirs*, when they happen to be sound, or perform their dyscrasic ebullitions when they are diseased.

The reader who is curious on the subject, will find some very ingenious arguments and speculations, by Professor Paget, and Dr. W. Budd, in support of the doctrine, that morbid material in the blood is the cause of many diseases of the skin, bones, joints, arteries, &c., not always ascribed to such a source. Dr. Budd, after expressing his opinion that this morbid material produces skin diseases by entering into union with portions of the cutaneous tissue, says that the morbid matter is liable from various causes to be repelled from the surface, and, in consequence, to produce various disorders in internal parts. In confirmation of this latter statement, he refers to Willan, "On Cutaneous Diseases," for illustrative instances, and gives the following interpretation of the occurrence:—"That the peculiar morbid matter of the disease, which was before detained in the part effected, and held in union with it, being now suddenly loosed and set afloat in the general circulation, has become free to fix on internal organs, or, circulating any where with the blood, to effect the system at large." But it is not only from the skin that he believes the morbid matter to be subject to repulsion. It may be from deeper-seated parts likewise, as from the tissues of the joints in gout, and he refers to "repelled gout" as explicable on the same principle as that which is expressed in the above quotation. Finally, *repulsion* of the morbid matter is not more essential to this pathology of the allopathic school, than it was to the similar pathology of Hahnemann. In the estimation of Dr. Budd and others, important internal organs, such as the aorta and other arteries, and the lungs, may become the seats of the most serious diseases by the morbid matter attaching itself to them in the first instance. It is thus that Dr. Budd, as others had done before him, accounts for the atheromatous patches on the interior of blood-vessels; it is thus that Baumes and others in later times, as Borden and Pujol before, explain the occurrence of pulmonary consumption; and it is thus that the origin of many local diseases which are included under the name of *scrofula*, is explained, as, by Pujol, when he says, "The slow but destructive poison which gives birth to *scrofula*, attacks indifferently all parts of the human body;" and by Müller who is said, by Dr. Tyler Smith, to suppose "that *struma*, (*scrofula*) is produced by the presence of an acrid or irritant principle in the liquor sanguinis" or blood. Here, then, we have all the essentials of Hahnemann's psoric pathology in the doc-

trines of his allopathic contemporaries or successors. The *only* difference (contagion excepted) between him and them being this, that what he, in general terms, alludes to as dependent on a morbid matter in the body, they seem to regard as due to several. The difference is, however, more in appearance than reality, for the term *psora*, by which Hahnemann's hypothesis is designated, is extremely indefinite, and seems never to have been employed expressly to distinguish any one special morbid condition; while all that he says of his psoric miasm may, without any violence to his pathological or practical doctrines, be understood as said of several, or even many miasms. The only *essential* particular in the psoric pathology is the recognition of *morbid matter*, (*materies morbi*.) of some kind or kinds, as the *constitutional taint*, or dyscrasia, on which chronic diseases depend for their manifestation, the obstinacy, and their liability to recur after being apparently removed; and it is of no consequence whatever to the general doctrine whether the matter be single or manifold.

Without believing that the modern doctrinal pathology of the allopathic physicians, to whom I have referred is correct in every particular, or in reference to every disease to which they have extended it, I am prepared to contend that it is just in the main, and *must* be held by every well-informed and observant physician. In saying so much in favor of this modern pathology, as held by allopathic physicians, I say, in effect, that I believe, and am prepared to show that Hahnemann's psoric doctrine is, in the main, just, and that it must be held by every intelligent physician. For Hahnemann's doctrine differs in no essential particular from theirs, and has no more to do with the itch than theirs,—nay, much less; for Schönlein specifies the individual disease, now distinguished as *itch* by its insect, as capable of causing internal diseases, which Hahnemann *never* did.

I need not enlarge upon the proofs of the general soundness of this pathology, both Hahnemannic and allopathic, because I believe that no one worthy of being argued with will dispute it, at least I shall wait until it is disputed by any respectable opponent. The kind of facts, however, on which the doctrine rests, I may briefly notice. First, then, they are analogical; as, for instance, when eruptions on the skin or internal diseases are produced by the reception of poisons or medicines into the body, as mercury, arsenic, lead, iodide of potassium, and a multitude of others. These are examples in which morbid substances are known to be introduced into the body, and the disorders which arise as a consequence are too familiar to admit of any doubt as to their being caused by those substances; while, in some instances, the *presence* of the morbid agent is detected, by

chemical means, in part especially which is the chief seat of the medicinal disease. Secondly, the facts are such as to admit of no question that a morbid matter, of the nature of an *animal poison*, and not merely drugs or inorganic poisons, is the cause of disease, as when blood is transferred from a diseased animal into a healthy one, and, in consequence of its containing a morbid matter, produces disease in the latter.—And thirdly, the facts which remain, if less pointedly and indubitable proofs of a morbid matter being the cause of the diseases to which they relate, than those direct evidences which have just been noticed; are far more satisfactorily explained in accordance with the doctrine which the latter serve to establish than with any other. Examples of this last class are the cases in which the sudden disappearance of eruptions from the surface, has been followed by serious and even fatal internal disease. Wellan records an instance in which repelled nettlerash was fatal, and mentions, among others of a similar kind, the case of a girl affected with lepra, who had the eruption repelled by drinking cold water while she was over-heated, and in consequence became affected with “a perpetual disposition to vomiting,” which resisted all remedies, and ceased in about eight months, only to be replaced by convulsions of the limbs and body, which remained unmitigated after several months of treatment. There are probably few practitioners who have not had occasion to remark equally, or even more severe consequences to follow the repulsion of chronic eczema of the scalp, and one or other of the forms of strophulus which affect infants. Of the latter, Wellan observes:—“If it be by any means suddenly repelled from the surface, diarrhoea, vomiting, spasmodic affections of the bowels, and often general disturbance of the constitution succeed; but on its reappearance those internal complaints immediately cease.” “On these remarks,” he adds, “a necessary caution is founded, not to expose infants, with the eruption upon them, to a stream of cold air, nor to plunge them into a cold bath, the most violent symptoms and even fatal consequences having occasionally resulted from such imprudent conduct.” A single additional instance from the same author is worthy of being quoted, as it illustrates the doctrine of Hahnemann on the agency of a psoric poison in producing internal diseases, independently of the primary occurrence of an eruption. Treating of lichen agrius, he says of a female who was ultimately the subject of it:—“During the year 1793, she had often complained of pains in the head and stomach, with a sense of depression and faintness. These symptoms were occasionally troublesome to her till the spring of 1794, when they were suddenly relieved by an appearance

of numerous red, tingling papule on the arms and wrists. At the beginning of the year 1795, in a severe frost, the eruption assumed a pustular form. The ulcerations succeeded them were partially covered blackish scabs, but continued to discharge a watery fluid for several months, and did not wholly heal till the end of the year. Since that time, she has been affected with pains of the limbs, headache, languor, and indigestion. These complaints are, from time to time removed, in consequence of the appearance of papule on the arms and other parts of the body," etc.

By the time that the work on Chronic Diseases was published, Homœopathy had a goodly number of professional disciples, among whom a diversity of opinion prevailed, regarding the soundness of the psoric hypothesis. Twenty or thirty years ago, *solidism*, or the doctrine which regards disease as primarily and peculiarly an affection of the properties of the living tissues, was generally, if not universally, the pathology of physicians in every country of Europe. It had succeeded, and gradually supplanted, the *humoral* pathology of former times, and some of the followers of Hahnemann had difficulty in entertaining the conception involved in the revived psoric pathology, that chronic diseases, which they had been accustomed to consider as affections peculiar to the solids of the body, depended in any degree upon so moveable a substance, as Hahnemann's doctrine supposed to be so essential an element of disease. The *facts* to which he appealed in support of his views, they, of course, knew to be unquestionable, but they had been accustomed to interpret them on a different principle, and to ascribe to the agency of the nervous system, in particular, what the resuscitated doctrine referred to—a fluctuating miasm or poison. To this day, homœopathic physicians remain divided on the subject of the psoric hypothesis; but I have no doubt that, in proportion as they reflect upon it more, in connection with a close observation of the phenomena of disease, they will come to be more and more as one in regarding the doctrine, whether they shall continue to distinguish it as the *psoric*, or shall learn to know it by a different name, as essentially sound and indispensable to just conceptions of the requisites for successful practice. Many of the allopathic party, as has been shown, have embraced pathological opinions that are almost identical with the psoric doctrine, and the general tendency of pathology in the present day is so strongly towards *humorism*, that the risk is of physicians running to such extremes on the subject, as to forget that man possesses "an animated nervous frame," as well as a "chemical mixt" in his constitution.

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

### THE BITE OF A COPPER-HEAD SNAKE

A CLERGYMAN about 30 years of age, of general good health, with the exception of a bronchial affection; in September, 1852, was bitten in the calf of the leg by a copper-headed snake. He immediately immersed the leg in black mud, after tying a handkerchief tightly around just below the knee. The first sensation of the bite was as of a scratch, or prick of a pin, or a nettle sting; followed by a burning smarting, and then a severe pain set in with the burning and smarting. The burning was like fire, and accompanying it was numb-prickling all over the body, but especially in the wounded leg. This numb-prickling sensation continued for several days.

The leg soon after the bite, began to swell and filled the boot-leg. When the limb was taken out of the mud, where it had been kept for about one hour; it was of a purplish color, evidently caused by congestion of the capillary veins. On removing the handkerchief, a sensation as of a rush, passed all over the body; but centered on the stomach with the most violent force, and a deathly sinking sickness. He was hardly able to lift his hand or elevate his head. When holding his head down, there was a roaring in the ears, and a feeling as if the eyes would burst from their sockets. All the first night he applied slices of raw onions, frequently renewed, and took a cathartic.

The sensation at the pit of the stomach was accompanied by vomiting, and followed at each emesis by a feeling as though the snake was coiled up in the stomach, and very cold. What he vomited seemed cold. There was also salivation which had the same coldness. Every time he thought of the snake, vomiting and gaging took place. After vomiting, there was a desire for large draughts of cold water, but dared not drink much, because vomiting would come on of water and the same coldness. Mouth parched, with a burnt feeling in it, or like a canker. Tongue felt stiff. When the fever subsided, purple spots, similar in some respects to bee-stings, appeared all over the surface of the body. On the way home after the bite, and all the first night, was very



drowsy. Sleep, full of horrid dreams of snakes, and a dream of this snake produced the same sensations of coldness, drooping, gaging and vomiting, which were also reproduced by thinking of this snake in his waking hours.

For four or five years afterwards, about the same season of the year in which he was bitten, the same spots made their appearance, accompanied by itching. Each spot about the size of a fifty cent piece.

DR. J. W. REDFIELD.

HARLEM, N. Y. CITY, May 27th, 1854.

#### QUARTERLY HOMŒOPATHIC MAGAZINE.

EDITED BY DRS. J. H. PULTE, H. P. GATCHELL, AND C. D. WILLIAMS. Published by DR. C. D. WILLIAMS, Cleveland, Ohio.

This is a continuation of the Monthly American Magazine of Homœopathy.

The junior Editor—his associates being "old stagers," knowing enough to keep their fingers out of the fire—makes his bow to the public in a vulgar, abusive article of some twelve pages, against us, personally. The reason for this attack is, that we expressed our opinion that the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania, can, for the present, meet the demands of our school, and that we did not acknowledge the "Western College of Homœopathic Medicine." The selfishness of such an article must appear to its readers, when usually a reaction takes place upon the author himself.

THE MARBLE AND GRANITE OF ANCIENT ROME.—The quantity of marble and granite employed in the decoration of ancient Rome can scarcely be estimated. According to Pliny (who also says that in thirty-five years more than a hundred sumptuous palaces were erected), there were as many statues as people,—every temple, portico, and public walk being crowded with them. Every street presented a succession of architectural effects; at every turn were fresh groups of noble edifices; of temples alone there were no less than four hundred and twenty. But, alas! the greater part of this magnificence has disappeared. Rome has proved a quarry for the world; her buildings have fallen; thousands of statues and sculptures have been carried away, or were previously destroyed, and many more still lie buried in this immense magazine of ancient power.—*The Builder*.

#### ALLOPATHIC PRESCRIPTIONS BASED ON CONJECTURE.

Our procedure gives us an immense advantage over our opponents, even in the employment of the very medicines which both of us use in diseases, which, to appearance, cure the same. For instance, they use *Ipecacuan*, and also *Mercury*, in dysentery; we do so likewise, but with this great superiority over them, that our rule directs us to the employment of *Ipecacuan*, where *Ipecacuan* is likely to be the most suitable and successful remedy, and of *Mercury*, where it is more likely to succeed; for all cases of dysentery are neither exactly similar in every respect, nor curable by the same remedy. Our opponents cannot adapt either of these medicines, with any degree of precision, or certainty, to the different cases for which they are respectively suitable; and when they do give the right remedy in the right case, it is simply and solely by chance;—for, what they call the *indications*, which seem to make it advisable that one of the medicines should be given in preference to the other, are mere matters of opinion, or hypothesis, on which there is no general agreement, and for which no valid reason can be adduced. The illustration I have just adverted to is, perhaps, the most favorable to the allopathic party that can be given, when there is any room for doubt as to what medicine is proper for a particular case of disease. In most of the instances in which, speaking in a general way, we employ the same remedies, their difficulties in fixing upon the right medicine for the right case are vastly increased by the choice lying among several or many. They have no rule to guide them, with the exception of that mis-named experience which proceeds on the resemblance in some of its chief characters, of the case under treatment, to one which had formerly been treated with success by a certain remedy. This rule is loose and uncertain, as a guide to practice, because it never can descend sufficiently to particulars, because two cases of the same disease, which agree in a few prominent features, may, and very often do, differ materially in their special characters, and in what they want, in order to be successfully treated.

The able address, by Dr. Paine, which we publish entire, should be read carefully by every Homœopathist, as well as those who desire a knowledge of the principles and practice of Homœopathy. We may, hereafter, comment upon one or two points which, so it seems to us, might have been stated with less ambiguity. Nevertheless, the reader will be able to perceive the sense without our aid. Exception may be taken to Dr Paine's practical use of the law of cure. To our mind, he presents it too narrow, for we believe there are degrees of *similarity*, and although one remedy for a case may be termed *the* remedy, and will cure more promptly and certainly than another, because it is the *most similar* to the diseased condition in its symptoms, yet other drugs more remote in their *similarity* of symptoms, come within the law, but they are less certain, and not so prompt in their curative action. In some instances the drug administered for a disease is so remote in its similarity, that in an attenuated dose, little or no influence is experienced, but the dose may be so large, that the paliative effect Dr. P. speaks of, may take place. If there is error in this branch of the address, it consists of not admitting degrees in "*similia similibus curantur.*"

The *psoric* doctrine of Hahnemann, as presented by Prof. Henderson, should not fail to command the attention of physicians, of whatever school. It is worthy of notice, that our opponents of the allopathic school, when they deny and ridicule certain doctrines advocated by Hahnemann, often actually deny doctrines of their own school, and ridicule themselves. We shall soon believe that some of the scribblers for allopathic journals need "another quarter's schooling," that they may be better read in the literature of their own branch of the profession.

BOERICKE & TAFEL, No. 24 South Fifth street, Philadelphia, are authorized agents for this Journal. Our friends in that city may hand their subscriptions for this Journal to the above firm, or to Matthew & Howard, 129 South Eighth street.

Subscribers will please not forget what they owe us, and remit the amount by mail, or otherwise, without delay.

Notice of the proceedings of the meeting of the American Institute of Homœopathy will appear in the next number.

**THE TOILET.**—There are certain moralists in the world, who labor under the impression that it is no matter what people wear, or how they put on their apparel. Such people cover themselves up, they do not dress. No one doubts that the mind is more important than the body, the jewel than the setting: and yet the virtue of the one and the brilliancy of the other are enhanced by the mode in which they are presented to the senses. Let a woman have every virtue under the sun, if she is slatternly, or even inappropriate in her dress, her merits will be more than half obscured. If, being young, she is dowdy or untidy, or being old, fantastic or slovenly, her mental qualifications stand a chance of being passed over with indifference or disgust.—*Chambers.*

**DOMESTIC LIFE IN THE MIDDLE AGES.**—Rude were the manners then; man and wife ate off the same trencher; a few wooden-handled knives, with blades of rugged iron, were a luxury for the great; candles unknown. A servant-girl held a torch at supper; one, or at most two mugs of coarse brown earthenware formed all the drinking apparatus in a house. Rich gentlemen wore clothes of unlined leather. Ordinary persons scarcely ever touched flesh meat. Noblemen drank little or no wine in summer; a little corn seemed wealth. Women had trivial marriage portions—even ladies dressed extremely plain. The chief part of a family's expense was what the males spent in arms and horses, none of which, however, were either very good or very showy; and grandees had to lay out money on their lofty towers. In Dante's comparatively polished times, ladies began to paint their cheeks by way of finery, going to the theatre, and to use less assiduity in spinning and plying their distaff. What is only a symptom of prosperity in large, is the sure sign of ruin in small states. So in Florence he might very well deplore what in London or Paris would be to praise or cause a smile. Wretchedly, indeed, plebeians hoveled; and if noble castles were cold, dark, and dreary, every where, they were infinitely worse in Italy, from the horrible modes of torture, characteristic cruelty, too frightful to dwell on. Few of the infamous structures built at the times treated of stand at present; yet their ruins disclose rueful corners.—*History of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem.*